



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,686	05/02/2005	Eiji Sugiyama	4777-62	6113
29540	7590	07/21/2010	EXAMINER	
DAY PITNEY LLP 7 TIMES SQUARE NEW YORK, NY 10036-7311			RIVIERE, HEIDI M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3689	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/21/2010	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

rschneider@daypitney.com  
kmcwha@daypitney.com  
psorge@daypitney.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/533,686	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SUGIYAMA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> HEIDI RIVIERE	<b>Art Unit</b> 3689	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 April 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11,20,42,43,54 and 55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11,20,42,43,54 and 55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed **12 April 2010** have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, however the current action is non-final to take into consideration the 35 USC 112 Second paragraph rejection applied below. Applicant argues the references used do not teach eco-value conversion because they detail calculations using gas and not organic compound. Page 72 of the specification notes that percentage of carbon is the conversion unit used. However, the gas in question is greenhouse gas emissions which uses oil and gas data (fig. 7) and that release of carbon(col. 3 and figures 7-13) by plants and other factors determine the offset and credit calculations. Ecological value index is argued as not being present in the references used to reject however, this value index is not specifically claimed in the apparatus claims presented in the current application. Therefore, the rejections are not withdrawn.
2. The 35 USC 101 rejection is withdrawn since the computing means shown to make up the now presented apparatus includes a computer readable medium.
3. Please note the 35 USC 112 Second paragraph rejection applied below to claim 20.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 3689

5. **Claim 20** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. According to MPEP Section 2181, “The disclosure of the structure (or material or acts) may be implicit or inherent in the specification if it would have been clear to those skilled in the art what structure (or material or acts) corresponds to the means (or step)-plus-function claim limitation. See *Id.* at 1380, 53 USPQ2d at 1229; *In re Dossel*, 115 F.3d 942, 946-47, 42 USPQ2d 1881, 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1997). If there is no disclosure of structure, material or acts for performing the recited function, the claim fails to satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.” Applicant claims “means for comparing the transfer request information” – however the specification is silent as to what the corresponding structure, material or acts of this means are. The specification notes, for example on page 64 that the system includes “The acquired transfer request information is outputted to the means for comparison”, however there is not mention of what this means could be in either the specification or the drawings. Therefore, the specification lacks corresponding structure as required by 35 USC 112, sixth paragraph and fails to comply with 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3689

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 11, 20, 54 and 55** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Leslie Webb, “Sticking to the Requirements of Eco-labels”**, PPI, Oct. 2000, Vol. 42, Iss. 10, page 39 (hereinafter “**Webb**”) in view of **Riina-Riitta Helminen, “Developing Tangible Measures for Eco-Efficiency: The Case of the Finnish and Swedish Pulp and Paper Industry”**, Business Strategy and the Environment, May/June 2000, page 196 (hereinafter “**Helminen**”).

8. **With respect to claims 11 and 55: (Currently Amended)** Webb teaches:

- First computing means for computing a production volume of the organic compound product produced using the plant-based resource; (Webb: page 2, paragraphs 5-8 – “manufacturer must calculate the reference consumption of fuels and imported electricity for on-site processes (for data provided) and then calculate its own electricity and fuel consumption” The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions calculate based on the production of virgin pulp for paper; levels of carbon dioxide emissions determined)
- A third computing means for computing a production volume of the organic compound product produced using the fossil based resource corresponding to the environmentally-friendly value-index. (pages 2-3 – eco-label for printing paper, covers woodfree and

Art Unit: 3689

wood containing papers; “manufacturer must calculate the reference consumption of fuels and imported electricity for on-site processes”; levels of carbon dioxide emissions determined)

Webb teaches the limitation in the rejection above however while Webb does not teach, Helminen teaches:

- A second computing means for computing an environmentally-friendly value index, which is an index for environmentally-friendly value, based on a production volume of the organic compound product produced using the plant-based resource; (pages 198-199 – value added equation with inventory variable as well as taxes and other factors that go into producing a product, used in cost production unit level)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Webb and Helminen and have a label on a product to signify that it falls within an environmentally-friendly value index. This details the environmental impact and effect of the product. Furthermore, CO<sub>2</sub> calculation can be based on the result of plant or fossil based production.

9. **With respect to claim 20:** (previously presented) Webb teaches a step of acquiring certification request information, the gist of which is a request for certification of a labeling right; a step of outputting certification information including information on a corresponding production volume, based on the certification request information acquired in the step of acquiring certification request information; a step of acquiring transfer request information, the gist of

Art Unit: 3689

which is a request for transfer of the labeling right received in correspondence with the output of the certification information according to the step of outputting said certification information; step of acquiring acceptance request information, the gist of which is a request for acceptance of the labeling right; and a step of comparing the transfer request information acquired in the step of acquiring said transfer request information, and the acceptance request information acquired in the step of acquiring acceptance request information. (pages 1-5 – eco-label for printing paper, covers woodfree and wood containing papers; “manufacturer must calculate the reference consumption of fuels and imported electricity for on-site processes”; levels of carbon dioxide emissions determined; threshold of CO<sub>2</sub> also determined in regards to the application of the label; pulps must be ‘derived from forests that have been certified by an approved system such as the Swedish FSC standard’)

10. **With respect to claim 54: (new)** Webb teaches:

- a first computing means for computing a production volume of the first organic compound and an amount of plant-based resource and an amount of fossil based resource used in producing the first organic compound, (Webb: page 2, paragraphs 5-8 – “manufacturer must calculate the reference consumption of fuels and imported electricity for on-site processes (for data provided) and then calculate its own electricity and fuel consumption” The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions calculate based on the production of virgin pulp for paper; levels of carbon dioxide emissions determined)

Art Unit: 3689

- a second computing means for computing an environmentally-friendly value index from the production volume of the first organic compound, the amount of plant based resource and the amount of fossil based resource used in producing the first organic compound, and the production method utilized in producing the first organic compound, (Webb: page 2, paragraphs 5-8 – “manufacturer must calculate the reference consumption of fuels and imported electricity for on-site processes (for data provided) and then calculate its own electricity and fuel consumption” The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions calculate based on the production of virgin pulp for paper; levels of carbon dioxide emissions determined) and

Webb teaches the limitation in the rejection above however while Webb does not teach, Helminen teaches:

- a third computing means for computing a production volume of a second organic compound corresponding to the environmentally-friendly value-index. (Helminen: pages 198-199 – value added equation with inventory variable as well as taxes and other factors that go into producing a product, used in cost production unit level)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Webb and Helminen and have a label on a product to signify that it falls within an environmentally-friendly value index. This details the environmental impact and effect of the product. Furthermore, CO<sub>2</sub> calculation can be based on the result of plant or fossil based production.



Art Unit: 3689

11. **Claims 42 and 43** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **McMorris, III et al. (US 2004/0230443)** (hereinafter "**McMorris**") in view of **Sandor et al. (US 2006/0184445)** (hereinafter "**Sandor**").

12. **With respect to claim 42:** (new) McMorris teaches converting an environmentally-friendly value index of plant-based resource, in terms of that of fossil-based resource, for communicating the environmental friendly value between a potential seller and a potential buyer. (paragraphs 59-62 - protocol uses "IPCC Global Warming Potential (GWP) conversion factors (to enable equivalent comparison of different greenhouse gases in terms of carbon dioxide equivalents)") McMorris does not teach however Sandor teaches an apparatus to convert units. (Fig. 16, columns 36-37 – software application program for calculating and communication conversions)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Sandor and McMorris. McMorris details a system used in the trading of carbon credits and conversion factors used to determine carbon dioxide equivalents. have been obvious to find that McMorris would teach an apparatus for converting data since McMorris entails a software program for doing so.

13. **With respect to claim 43:** (new) McMorris teaches the limitations in claim 42 cited in the rejection above. However, while McMorris does not Sandor teaches certifying the environmentally-friendly value index by a third party other than the potential seller and the potential buyer. (paragraphs 140, 220 – renewable energy certificates integrated into system)

Art Unit: 3689

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Sandor and McMorris. McMorris details a system used in the trading of carbon credits and conversion factors used to determine carbon dioxide equivalents. Sandor also teaches a carbon credits trading system however it details that these credits can be certified.

### **CONCLUSION**

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Heidi Riviere whose telephone number is 571-270-1831. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00am-5:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janice Mooneyham can be reached on 571-272-6805. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3689

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Heidi Riviere/

Examiner, Art Unit 3689

/Dennis Ruhl/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3689